arXiv:1212.6726v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 30 Dec 2012

Exactness of the mean-field dynamics in the optical cavity system

Takashi Mori
Department of Physics, Graduate School of Science,
The University of Tokyo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo 113-0033, Japan

January 1, 2013

Abstract

Validity of the mean-field approach to open system dynamics in the optical cavity system is examined. It is rigorously shown that the mean-field approach is justified in the thermodynamic limit. The result is applicable to nonequilibrium situations, e.g. the thermal reservoirs may have different temperatures, and the system may be subject to a time-dependent external field. The result of this work will lead to further studies on macroscopic open quantum systems.

1 Introduction

Quantum dynamics in many body systems is a very important topic for many branches of physics. In particular, recent studies in the field of statistical physics have focused on dynamical problems such as thermalization [1–5], phase transitions induced by the parameter quench [6–9], and nonequilibrium phase transitions [10–12]. Theoretically, it is difficult to precisely describe the time evolution of a many body system. Although recent works succeeded to treat the exact time evolution and observe relaxation processes in some integrable systems [13–15], we should be content with some approximate treatments in general.

One of the important approximate approaches is the MF approximation for not only equilibrium statics but also nonequilibrium dynamics. In this approximation, the N-body state vector or the N-body density matrix is approximated by the product state. Interestingly, the MF approach predicts some remarkable results such as the absence of thermalization and purely dynamical phase transitions in some isolated quantum systems [9, 10]. Also in open quantum systems, nonequilibrium phase transitions have been studied by the MF approach [16–18], and see also Ref. [19] for the recent result.

Some of these predictions might be the peculiarity of the MF theory and not universal in general. But, importantly, there are several models in which the MF treatment becomes exact in some ideal limit [20–23]. Thus the MF theory is completely reliable as long as such an ideal limit is considered to be realized. For example, in a quantum spin system with a global coupling (the infinite-range interaction), it is known that the quantum dynamics is exactly described by the MF dynamical equation (or Hartree equation) [20]. Another example is the N-body bosonic system interacting via the two-body potential of the scattering length a, in which the time-dependent Gross-Pitaevskii equation, which is regarded as the MF theory of the dynamics of the Bose-Einstein condensate, becomes exact in the limit of $N \to \infty$ with a fixed value of Na [21]. Because of the existence of such ideal limits, the MF approximation takes a special position among other approximate approaches.

Therefore, we should not regard the MF approach as a mere crude approximation. Rather it is important to clarify the condition under which the MF approach is justified and extend the possibility of experimental realization of remarkable predictions of the MF approach.

This article is mainly devoted to investigating the quantum dynamics of the system consisting of N two-level atoms interacting with a single quantized boson mode in an optical cavity. This system is described by the Dicke model [24]. We consider its extension, that is, we allow each element of the system, i.e. single cavity mode of photons and N two-level atoms, to be attached to its own environment. Each environment is a Hamilton system, and may or may not be a large system. If one environment has a continuous energy spectrum, which means that the environment is an infinitely large system, it plays the role of a dissipative thermal bath.

The MF approach of this model predicts interesting dynamical or nonequilibrium phase transitions. In the isolated Dicke model (there is no environment), it was argued that dynamical phase transitions occur by the MF approach [9]. In open systems (the Dicke model interacting with dissipative environments), under the time-periodic driving field, the MF dynamics combined with the method of the Born-Markov quantum master equation [25] predicts some nonequilibrium phase transitions including optical bistabilities [17,18] which were observed in experiments [26]. It has been believed that the MF approach is justified in the limit of $N \to \infty$ because in this model N two-level atoms interact with a common cavity mode of photons, and it is expected that each atom feels only the MF produced by the other atoms via radiation and absorption of cavity photons. In this situation, the correlation between two atoms or between an atom and cavity photons will be not so important. However there has not been rigorous proof of this expectation yet. The aim of this work is to provide its rigorous proof.

The organization of this paper is as follows. In Sec. 2, we introduce the proof of the fact that the MF theory is justified in infinite-range spin models. This result is already known [20], but we review it because it is the simplest case where the MF approach is justified rigorously. In Sec. 3, the model considered in the present work is explained. In Sec. 4, some preliminaries are made. We introduce the two notions important later, i.e. the Q-representation of the density matrix and restriction of the class of physical observables. In Sec. 5, the main result of this paper is stated, and some comments on this main result are mentioned. In Sec. 6, the main result is proven.

2 Exactness of the mean-field dynamics in infinite-range spin models

Before studying the optical cavity system, let us analyze the simplest case where the MF dynamics becomes exact in the thermodynamic limit. We consider the N spin system with infinitely long-range interactions. The Hilbert space for ith spin is denoted by $\mathcal{H}_i$. Let $h_i = h$ a bounded self-adjoint operator acting on $\mathcal{H}_i$, and let $V_{ij} = V$ $(i \neq j)$ also a bounded self-adjoint operator acting on $\mathcal{H}_i \otimes \mathcal{H}_j$. We put $V_{ii} = 0$. The Hamiltonian of the spin system with infinite-range two-body interactions is generally written as

$$H = \sum_i h_i + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{ij}^{N} V_{ij}. \tag{1}$$

We introduce the p-norm of an operator A acting on $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{k}\mathcal{H}_i$ as

$$\|A\|_p^{(k)} := \left(\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\dots,k}|A|^p\right)^{1/p}. \tag{2}$$

In particular, the operator norm is defined as

$$\|A\|_\infty := \sup_{\psi\in\bigotimes_{i=1}^{k}\mathcal{H}_i} \frac{\langle\psi||A||\psi\rangle}{\langle\psi|\psi\rangle}. \tag{3}$$

The operator A is said to be bounded if $\|A\|_\infty < +\infty$.

The N-spin density matrix at time t is denoted by $\rho_{N,t}$, and its k-marginal reduced density matrix by $\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)}$ which is defined as

$$\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)} := \mathrm{Tr}_{k+1,k+2,\dots,N}\,\rho_{N,t}. \tag{4}$$

The initial condition is assumed to satisfy

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\left|\gamma_{N,0}^{(k)} - \gamma_0^{\otimes k}\right|_1^{(k)} = 0 \quad \forall k\in\mathbb{N}, \tag{5}$$

that is, reduced density matrices are initially factorized. Here γ_0 is a single spin density matrix.

The MF theory assumes that reduced density matrices are always factorized,

$$\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)} \approx \gamma_{\mathrm{MF},t}^{(k)} = \gamma_t^{\otimes k} \quad \forall k\in\mathbb{N}. \tag{6}$$

The single spin density matrix γ_t obeys the Hartree equation,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{d}{dt}\gamma_t &= -i\mathcal{L}_1^{(0)}\gamma_t - i\mathrm{Tr}_2\mathcal{L}_{12}^{(V)}\gamma_t\otimes\gamma_t \\ &= -i[h_1,\gamma_t] + \mathrm{Tr}_2[V_{12},\gamma_t\otimes\gamma_t].\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

The Liouville operators are defined as $\mathcal{L}_i^{(0)}(\cdot) := [h_i,(\cdot)]$ and $\mathcal{L}_{ij}^{(V)}(\cdot) := [V_{ij},(\cdot)]$.

The statement of exactness of the MF dynamics is that if the initial state satisfies Eq. (5),

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\left\|\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)} - \gamma_t^{\otimes k}\right\|_1^{(k)} = 0 \tag{8}$$

for any fixed $k\in\mathbb{N}$ and $t>0$.[1]

From Eq. (8) it is immediately verified, by using the inequality $\|AB\|_1^{(k)} \le \|A\|_\infty\|B\|_1^{(k)}$, that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\left|\left\langle\mathcal{O}^{(k)}\right\rangle_{N,t} - \left\langle\mathcal{O}^{(k)}\right\rangle_{\mathrm{MF},t}\right| = 0, \tag{9}$$

---

[1] Exactness of the MF dynamics does *not* mean $\rho_{N,t} = \gamma_t^{\otimes N}$. Actually, it does not hold even in infinite-range spin models.

for any *bounded* operator $\mathcal{O}^{(k)}$ acting on $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{k}\mathcal{H}_i$. Here $\langle\cdot\rangle_{N,t} := \mathrm{Tr}(\cdot)\rho_{N,t}$ and $\langle\cdot\rangle_{\mathrm{MF},t} := \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\dots,k}(\cdot)\gamma^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},t}$.

We follow Ref. [22] for the proof of Eq. (8). We start with the Liouville equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{N,t} = -i\left(\sum_{i=1}^{N}\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_i + \frac{1}{N}\sum_{ij}^{N}\mathcal{L}^{(V)}_{ij}\right)\rho_{N,t}. \tag{10}$$

By tracing out over $\bigotimes_{i=k+1}^{N}\mathcal{H}_k$, we obtain the hierarchical equations (BBGKY hierarchy[2]) for $\{\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t}\}$ [22],

$$\frac{d}{dt}\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t} = -i\sum_{i=1}^{k}\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_i\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t} + \mathcal{W}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k+1)}_{N,t} + \frac{1}{N}\mathcal{V}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t} - \frac{k}{N}\mathcal{W}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k+1)}_{N,t}. \tag{11}$$

The super-operators $\mathcal{V}^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{(k)}$ are defined by

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{V}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t} := -i\sum_{ij}^{k}\mathcal{L}^{(V)}_{ij}\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t}, \\ \mathcal{W}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k+1)}_{N,t} := -i\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\mathcal{L}^{(V)}_{i,k+1}\gamma^{(k+1)}_{N,t}. \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

The MF solution $\gamma^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},t} = \gamma_t^{\otimes k}$ satisfies the equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\gamma^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},t} = -i\sum_{i=1}^{k}\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_i\gamma^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},t} + \mathcal{W}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k+1)}_{\mathrm{MF},t}, \tag{13}$$

which is obtained by formally taking the limit of $N\to\infty$ in Eq. (11).

It should be remarked that only the fact that Eq. (13) is obtained from Eq. (11) by formally taking the limit of $N\to\infty$ does not ensure that the MF dynamics is exact in this limit. Because Eq. (11) forms a coupled chain of N equations of motion, the terms proportional to $1/N$ in Eq. (11) might be amplified in the chain and have nonnegligible contribution. In particular, for a very large $k \lesssim N$, the last two terms in RHS of Eq. (11) is no longer small. We must prove that these terms actually do not trouble.

The next step is to construct the *Duhamel series* [22] by formally integrating Eq. (11). We define

$$U^{(k)}_t := \exp\left[-i\sum_{i=1}^{k}\mathcal{L}^{(0)}_i t\right].$$

Then we obtain

$$\gamma_{N,t} = U^{(k)}_t\gamma^{(k)}_{N,0} + \int_0^t dt_1 U^{(k)}_{t-t_1}\mathcal{W}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k+1)}_{N,t_1} \tag{14}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{N}\int_0^t dt_1 U^{(k)}_{t-t_1}\mathcal{V}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t_1} - \frac{k}{N}\int_0^t dt_1 U^{(k)}_{t-t_1}\mathcal{W}^{(k)}\gamma^{(k+1)}_{N,t_1}. \tag{15}$$

---

[2] Bogoliubov-Born-Green-Kirkwood-Yvon hierarchy

We substitute this expression iteratively to the terms in RHS not proportional to $1/N$ (the second term of RHS in the above equation), and repeat this procedure L times, then we obtain the following so called the Duhamel series expansion,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t} =& \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U^{(k)}_{t-t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1-t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \dots \mathcal{W}^{k+l-1} U^{(k+l)}_{t_l} \gamma^{(k+l)}_{N,0} \\
&+ \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L U^{(k)}_{t-t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1-t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \dots U^{(k+L-1)}_{t_{L-1}-t_L} \mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)} \gamma^{(k+L)}_{N,t_L} \\
&+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U^{(k)}_{t-t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1-t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \dots U^{(k+l-1)}_{t_{l-1}-t_l} \mathcal{V}^{(k+l-1)} \gamma^{(k+l-1)}_{N,t_l} \\
&- \sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{k+l-1}{N} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U^{(k)}_{t-t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1-t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \\
&\qquad\qquad\qquad \dots U^{(k+l-1)}_{t_{l-1}-t_l} \mathcal{W}^{(k+l-1)} \gamma^{(k+l)}_{N,t_l}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{16}
$$

The Duhamel series of the MF density matrix is written as

$$
\begin{aligned}
\gamma^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},t} =& \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \int_0^t dt_1 \dots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U^{(k)}_{t-t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1-t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \dots \mathcal{W}^{(k+l-1)} U^{(k+l)}_{t_l} \gamma^{(k+l)}_{\mathrm{MF},0} \\
+& \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L U^{(k)}_{t-t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1-t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \dots U^{(k+L-1)}_{t_{L-1}-t_L} \mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)} \gamma^{(k+L)}_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{17}
$$

From these expressions, we shall show $\|\gamma^{(k)}_{N,t} - \gamma^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},t}\|^{(k)}_1 \to 0$ in the limit of $N \to \infty$. From Eqs. (16) and (17), we obtain

$$
\left\| \gamma^{(k)}_{N,t} - \gamma^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF}} \right\|^{(k)}_1 \leq A_1 + A_2 + A_3 + A_4, \tag{18}
$$

where A_i $(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ are given by

$$
\begin{cases}
A_1 = \displaystyle\sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l \Big\| U^{(k)}_{t-t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1-t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \\
\qquad\qquad\qquad \dots \mathcal{W}^{k+l-1} U^{(k+l)}_{t_l} \left(\gamma^{(k+l)}_{N,0} - \gamma^{(k+l)}_{\mathrm{MF},0} \right) \Big\|^{(k)}_1, \\
A_2 = \displaystyle\int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L \Big\| U^{(k)}_{t-t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1-t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \\
\qquad\qquad\qquad \dots U^{(k+L-1)}_{t_{L-1}-t_L} \mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)} \left(\gamma^{(k+L)}_{N,t_L} - \gamma^{(k+L)}_{\mathrm{MF},t_L} \right) \Big\|^{(k)}_1,
\end{cases}
$$

and

$$\begin{cases} A_3 = \dfrac{1}{N} \displaystyle\sum_{l=1}^{L} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l \left\| U_{t-t_1}^{(k)} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U_{t_1-t_2}^{(k+1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \right. \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad \left. \dots U_{t_{l-1}-t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \mathcal{V}^{(k+l-1)} \gamma_{N,t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \right\|_1^{(k)}, \\ A_4 = \displaystyle\sum_{l=1}^{L} \dfrac{k+l-1}{N} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \dots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l \left\| U_{t-t_1}^{(k)} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U_{t_1-t_2}^{(k+1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \right. \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad \left. \dots U_{t_{l-1}-t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+l-1)} \gamma_{N,t_l}^{(k+l)} \right\|_1^{(k)}. \end{cases}$$

Now we evaluate A_i. Since $U_t^{(k)}$ is a unitary operator, it does not change the norm, $\|U_t^{(k)}(\cdot)\|_1^{(k)} = \|(\cdot)\|_1^{(k)}$. We further use the inequality $\|AB\|_1^{(k)} \le \|A\|_\infty \|B\|_1^{(k)}$. As a result, A_1 is evaluated, by recalling the definitions of $\mathcal{V}^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{(k)}$, as

$$A_1 \le \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \frac{t^l}{l!} (2\|V\|_\infty)^l \frac{(k+l-1)!}{(k-1)!} \left\| \gamma_{N,0}^{(k+l)} - \gamma_{\mathrm{MF},0}^{(k+l)} \right\|_1^{(k+l)}.$$

By the assumption for the initial condition, Eq. (5), $A_1 \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$ at a fixed L. Similarly, the upper bound of A_2 becomes

$$\begin{aligned} A_2 &\le \frac{t^L}{L!} (2\|V\|_\infty)^L \frac{(k+L-1)!}{(k-1)!} \left\| \gamma_{N,t_L}^{(k+l)} - \gamma_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}^{(k+l)} \right\|_1^{(k+l)} \\ &\le \frac{(k+L-1)!}{L!(k-1)!} (2\|V\|_\infty t)^L \times 2. \end{aligned}$$

In the last inequality, we used $\left\| \gamma_{N,t_L}^{(k+l)} - \gamma_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}^{(k+l)} \right\|_1^{(k+l)} \le 2$. Since $(k+L-1)!/[L!(k-1)!] \le 2^{k+L-1}$, we have

$$A_2 \le 2^k (4\|V\|_\infty t)^L.$$

If we restrict the time to $t \le t_0 := 1/(8\|V\|_\infty)$ (this restriction will be removed later), we have $A_2 \le 2^{k-L}$. If we take the limit of $L \to \infty$ after $N \to \infty$, both A_1 and A_2 converge to zero.

Similarly, we can show that A_3 and A_4 also converge to zero in the same limit. The upper bound of A_3 is evaluated as

$$\begin{aligned} A_3 &\le \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} \frac{t^l}{l!} (2\|V\|_\infty)^l (k+l-1) \frac{(k+l-1)!}{(k-1)!} \\ &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} (2\|V\|_\infty t)^l (k+l-1) \frac{(k+l-1)!}{l!(k-1)!} \\ &\le \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} 2^{k-1} (k+l-1) (4\|V\|_\infty t)^l. \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

If we take the limit of $N \to \infty$ first, obviously A_3 goes to zero. A_4 is also bounded from above by Eq. (19). Therefore, it has been proven that $\lim_{L\to\infty} \lim_{N\to\infty} A_i = 0$ for the time interval $0 \le t \le t_0$.

The restriction of t_0 is not essential. Since $\left\{\gamma_{N,t_0}^{(k)}\right\}$ satisfies the assumption of Eq. (5), we can start with $\left\{\gamma_{N,t_0}^{(k)}\right\}$ at time t_0 as a new initial condition. By applying the same argument above, it is concluded that Eq. (8) holds in the time interval $0 \leq t \leq 2t_0$. Repeating this argument, we can extend $t_0 \to \infty$, and Eq. (8) is proved for an arbitrary time $t \geq 0$.

The above proof relies on the boundedness of the operators. In optical systems, however, the above proof cannot be used as it is since the creation and the annihilation operators of bosons are unbounded. We construct the proof for such a situation in the following sections.

3 Model

We consider the Schrödinger dynamics of the generalized Dicke model given by

$$H(t) = \sum_{j=0}^{N} \left(H_{\mathrm{S}_j}(t) + H_{\mathrm{B}_j} + H_{\mathrm{I}_j}\right) + V, \tag{20}$$

$$\begin{cases} H_{\mathrm{S}_0}(t) = \omega_p a^\dagger a + \sqrt{N}\xi(t)(a + a^\dagger), \\ H_{\mathrm{S}_j} = \omega_a \sum_{i=1}^{N} S_j^z \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, N), \\ H_{\mathrm{B}_0} = \sum_r \omega_r b_r^\dagger b_r, \\ H_{\mathrm{I}_0} = \sum_r \lambda_r (b_r a^\dagger + b_r^\dagger a), \\ V = \dfrac{g}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{j=1}^{N} (a X_j^\dagger + a^\dagger X_j). \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

In $H_{\mathrm{S}_j}(t)$, the index $j = 0$ corresponds to the single mode of cavity photons driven by the external field $\xi(t)$, and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$ corresponds to the ensemble of N two-level atoms. Cavity photons (H_{S_0}) interact with the free Bose field H_{B_0} through the coupling H_{I_0}. Each two-level atom H_{S_j}, $j = 1, 2, \ldots N$, interacts with an arbitrary Hamilton system H_{B_j} through an arbitrary interaction Hamiltonian H_{I_j}. We call the system of the Hamiltonian H_{B_j} "j-environment" ($j = 0, 1, \ldots, N$), and call the composite system described by the Hamiltonian $H_{\mathrm{S}_j}(t) + B_{\mathrm{B}_j} + H_{\mathrm{I}_j}$ "j-subsystem". We assume that $H_{\mathrm{B}_j} + H_{\mathrm{I}_j}$ are identical for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$; the Hamiltonian $H(t)$ is symmetric under the exchange of two indices i and j ($i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, N$).

The last term of Eq. (20) represents the interaction between the cavity photons and the ensemble of atoms. If we choose $X_j = S_j^x$ (S_j^-), the Hamiltonian $\sum_{j=0}^{N} H_{\mathrm{S}_j}(t) + V$ is called the Dicke model (Tavis-Cummings model), respectively, with a driving force ξ. Therefore, we can regard Eq. (20) as an extension of the Dicke-like model; environmental systems are attached to it.

If the j-environment has a continuous spectrum, then this environment acts as a thermal reservoir in contact with H_{S_j}. We can obtain the Hamiltonian with a continuous spectrum as a limiting case of the discrete spectrum. It is necessary to properly choose the coupling constants $\{\lambda_r\}$ between cavity photons and 0-environment in order to have a well-defined limit. We introduce a parameter Λ so that the number of eigenmodes with the frequency between ω and $\omega + d\omega$ is given by $\Lambda D(\omega) d\omega$. Thus the limit of $\Lambda \to \infty$ corresponds to the limit of a continuum of 0-environmental modes. We assume that $\lambda_r \sim \lambda(\omega_r)/\sqrt{\Lambda}$. In this case, if we consider the limit of the continuous spectrum of the 0-environment, $\sum_r \to \Lambda \int_0^\infty d\omega D(\omega)$, and therefore, $\sum_r |\lambda_r|^2 \to \int_0^\infty d\omega D(\omega) \lambda(\omega)^2 =: \int_0^\infty d\omega J(\omega)$ does not depend on Λ. Here, $J(\omega)$ is called the spectral density [27]. We assume that

$$\sum_r |\lambda_r|^2 < +\infty \tag{22}$$

in order not to diverge the effect of the 0-environment on the dynamics of cavity photons. In general, for the proof of the justification of the MF treatment, Λ is arbitrary (it can even depend on N). When $\Lambda \ll N$, the effect of the 0-environment on the dynamics of the whole system is negligible. When $\Lambda \sim N$, the 0-environment affects the dynamics of the total system. When $\Lambda \gg N$, the 0-environment behaves as a thermal reservoir, and cause the dissipation.

Mean-field dynamics

The density matrix of the whole system, $\rho_{N,t}$, is defined on the Hilbert space $\bigotimes_{i=0}^N \mathcal{H}_i$, where $\mathcal{H}_j$ $(j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, N)$ is the Hilbert space of the j-subsystem. The MF theory assumes that the k-marginal reduced density matrix $\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)} = \mathrm{Tr}_{k+1,\ldots,N} \rho_{\mathrm{MF},t}$ is in the product form,

$$\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)} \approx \gamma_{\mathrm{MF},t}^{(k)} = (\rho_{\mathrm{p}})_t \otimes (\rho_{\mathrm{a}})_t^{\otimes k}. \tag{23}$$

$(\rho_{\mathrm{p}})_t$ is the density matrix for the 0-subsystem. Similarly, $(\rho_{\mathrm{a}})_t$ is a common density matrix for the k-subsystem $(k = 1, 2, \ldots, N)$. The density matrices $(\rho_{\mathrm{p}})_t$ and $(\rho_{\mathrm{a}})_t$ obey the following Hartree equations,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}(\rho_{\mathrm{p}})_t = & -i \Big[\omega_p a^\dagger a + \sqrt{N} \xi(t)(a + a^\dagger) + H_{\mathrm{B}_0} + H_{\mathrm{I}_0} \\ & + \sqrt{N} g \Big\{ [\mathrm{Tr} X_1 (\rho_{\mathrm{a}})_t] a^\dagger + \sqrt{N} g [\mathrm{Tr} X_1^\dagger (\rho_{\mathrm{a}})_t] a \Big\}, (\rho_{\mathrm{p}})_t \Big], \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\rho_{\mathrm{a}})_t = -i \left[\omega_a S_1^z + H_{\mathrm{B}_1} + H_{\mathrm{I}_1} + \frac{g}{\sqrt{N}} \Big\{ [\mathrm{Tr} a (\rho_{\mathrm{p}})_t] X_1^\dagger + [\mathrm{Tr} a^\dagger (\rho_{\mathrm{p}})_t] X_1 \Big\}, (\rho_{\mathrm{a}})_t \right]. \tag{25}$$

The apparent N-dependence can be removed by the appropriate scaling in the coherent state representation, see Sec. 4.1.

It is stressed that the MF theory here corresponds to neglect the correlation between i and j-subsystems. In general, we cannot neglect the correlation between the system of interest (H_{S_j}) and environments (H_{I_j}).

4 Preliminaries

Although we cannot justify the MF theory straightforwardly in the same way as we did in the spin systems, we follow essentially the same course. We derive the BBGKY hierarchy for the reduced density matrices, and construct the Duhamel series expansion, and evaluate each term. However, because of unboundedness of boson operators we cannot use the trace norm, and the statement itself must be modified. Some preliminaries are necessary before presenting the main result of this work.

4.1 Duhamel series expansion in the coherent state representation

Since the density matrix $\rho_{N,t}$ obeys the Liouville equation

$$\frac{d}{dt}\rho_{N,t} = -i[H(t), \rho_{N,t}] =: -i\mathcal{L}\rho_{N,t}, \tag{26}$$

we obtain the following chain of equations of motion for $\left\{\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)}\right\}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d}{dt}\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)} = &-i\left[\sum_{j=0}^{k}\left(H_{\mathrm{S}_j} + H_{\mathrm{B}_j} + H_{\mathrm{I}_j}\right), \gamma_{N,t}^{(k)}\right] \\
&- i\left[\frac{g}{\sqrt{N}}\left(a\sum_{j=1}^{k}X_j^\dagger + a^\dagger\sum_{j=1}^{k}X_j\right), \gamma_{N,t}^{(k)}\right] \\
&- i(N-k)\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1}\left[\frac{g}{\sqrt{N}}\left(aX_{k+1}^\dagger + a^\dagger X_{k+1}\right), \gamma_{N,t}^{(k+1)}\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

Because it is hard to see which terms are important in the limit of $N \to \infty$, and because the relation to the MF theory is not obvious in this form, let us introduce the Husimi's "Q-representation" of the reduced density matrix [28]:

$$Q_{N,t}^{(k)}(\alpha, \{\beta_r\}) = \left(\frac{N}{\pi}\right)^{\mathcal{N}+1} {}_0\!\left\langle\sqrt{N}\alpha; \{\sqrt{N}\beta_r\}\right|\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)}\left|\sqrt{N}\alpha; \{\sqrt{N}\beta_r\}\right\rangle_0. \tag{28}$$

Here $\mathcal{N}$ is the number of modes of 0-environment ($\mathcal{N} = \sum_r 1 \simeq \int_0^\infty D(\omega)d\omega$). The vector $\left|\sqrt{N}\alpha, \{\sqrt{N}\beta_r\}\right\rangle_0$ denotes the coherent state on the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_0$, and it satisfies

$$a\left|\sqrt{N}\alpha, \{\sqrt{N}\beta_r\}\right\rangle_0 = \sqrt{N}\alpha\left|\sqrt{N}\alpha, \{\sqrt{N}\beta_r\}\right\rangle_0, \tag{29}$$

$$b_r\left|\sqrt{N}\alpha, \{\sqrt{N}\beta_r\}\right\rangle_0 = \sqrt{N}\beta_r\left|\sqrt{N}\alpha, \{\sqrt{N}\beta_r\}\right\rangle_0. \tag{30}$$

Notice that $Q_{N,t}^{(k)}$ is still a matrix on the Hilbert space $\bigotimes_{j=1}^{k}\mathcal{H}_j$.

$Q_{N,t}^{(k)}$ has the following properties:

(i) $Q_{N,t}^{(k)} \geq 0$,

(ii) $\displaystyle\int d^2\alpha\left(\prod_{r=1}\int d^2\beta_r\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k}Q_{N,t}^{(k)} = 1$,

(iii) $$\mathrm{Tr}_{0,1,\ldots,k}\mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\frac{a}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{a^\dagger}{\sqrt{N}}, \left\{\frac{b_r}{\sqrt{N}}, \frac{b_r^\dagger}{\sqrt{N}}\right\}\right)\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)} = \int d^2\alpha\left(\prod_{r=1}\int d^2\beta_r\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k}\mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\})Q_{N,t}^{(k)},$$

where $\mathcal{O}^{(k)}$ is an arbitrary *anti-normal ordered* operator acting on $\bigotimes_{j=0}^{k}\mathcal{H}_j$; namely, all the annihilation operators are in the left of all the creation operators. From the above properties, we can obtain the expectation value of any observable $\mathcal{O}^{(k)}$ from $Q_{N,t}^{(k)}$.

An advantage to use $Q_{N,t}^{(k)}$ instead of $\gamma_{N,t}^{(k)}$ is that it becomes easy to see which terms are important and which terms are likely to be negligible in the limit of $N\to\infty$. Indeed, the time evolution equation of $Q_{N,t}^{(k)}$ is given by

$$\frac{d}{dt}Q_{N,t}^{(k)}=-i(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{p}}(t)+\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(k)}(\alpha))Q_{N,t}^{(k)}+\left(1-\frac{k}{N}\right)\mathcal{W}^{(k)}Q_{N,t}^{(k+1)}+\frac{1}{N}\mathcal{V}^{(k)}Q_{N,t}^{(k)},\tag{31}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}-i\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{p}}(t)Q_{N,t}^{(k)}:=&i\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha}\left[\left(\omega_p\alpha+\xi(t)+\sum_r\lambda_r\beta_r\right)Q_{N,t}^{(k)}\right]\\&-i\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha^*}\left[\left(\omega_p\alpha^*+\xi(t)+\sum_r\lambda_r^*\beta_r^*\right)Q_{N,t}^{(k)}\right]\\&+i\sum_r\left\{\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta_r}\left[\left(\omega_r\beta_r+\lambda_r\alpha\right)Q_{N,t}^{(k)}\right]-\frac{\partial}{\partial\beta_r^*}\left[\left(\omega_r\beta_r^*+\lambda_r^*\alpha^*\right)Q_{N,t}^{(k)}\right]\right\},\end{aligned}\tag{32}$$

which corresponds to the free time evolution of the 0-subsystem, and

$$-i\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(k)}(\alpha)Q_{N,t}^{(k)}:=-i\left[\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\omega_a S_j^z+H_{\mathrm{B}_j}+H_{\mathrm{I}_j}\right)+g\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\alpha X_j^\dagger+\alpha^*X_j\right),Q_{N,t}^{(k)}\right],\tag{33}$$

which represents the time evolution for k atoms and environments under the "effective field" $g\sum_{j=1}^{k}\left(\alpha X_j^\dagger+\alpha^*X_j\right)$. The super-operator $\mathcal{V}^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{W}^{(k)}$ are defined by

$$\mathcal{V}^{(k)}Q_{N,t}^{(k)}:=ig\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha}Q_{N,t}^{(k)}\sum_{j=1}^{k}X_j-ig\sum_{j=1}^{k}X_j^\dagger\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha^*}Q_{N,t}^{(k)},\tag{34}$$

$$\mathcal{W}^{(k)}Q_{N,t}^{(k+1)}:=ig\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha}\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1}X_{k+1}Q_{N,t}^{(k+1)}-ig\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha^*}\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1}X_{k+1}^\dagger Q_{N,t}^{(k+1)}.\tag{35}$$

As was mentioned in Sec. 3, it is remarked that if we consider the case in which the 0-environment acts as a thermal bath, the limit of $\Lambda\to\infty$ should be taken *before* $N\to\infty$. By assumption, $\{\lambda_r\}$ satisfies $\sum_r|\lambda_r|^2<\infty$ in the limit of $\Lambda\to\infty$. In this case, the state of the 0-environment is almost unchanged, that is, $\langle b_r\rangle\sim\sqrt{N}\beta_r\sim O(\sqrt{N}\lambda_r)\sim O(\sqrt{N/\Lambda})$, if the 0-environment is initially in equilibrium, so it is consistent with the interpretation that the 0-environment is a thermal reservoir. On the other hand, as is seen in the above estimation, when $\Lambda\sim O(N)$, the state of the 0-environment is strongly disturbed, and it cannot be regarded as a thermal bath in this case. Anyway, the justification of the MF approach is possible for both these two cases.

If we formally take the limit of $N\to\infty$ in Eq. (31), we obtain the following equation of motion:

$$\frac{d}{dt}Q_{\mathrm{MF},t}^{(k)}=-i(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{p}}(t)+\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(k)}(\alpha))Q_{\mathrm{MF},t}^{(k)}+\mathcal{W}^{(k)}Q_{\mathrm{MF},t}^{(k+1)}.\tag{36}$$

If initially the density matrix is in the product form,

$$Q^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},0} = Q^{(0)}_{\mathrm{MF},0} \otimes (\rho_{\mathrm{a}})_0^{\otimes k}, \quad \forall k \in \mathbb{N}$$

the solution of Eq. (36) is equivalent to that of the MF dynamical equation. Therefore, we shall compare the solutions of Eq. (31) with those of Eq. (36).

We define the time evolution operator due to $-i\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{p}}(t) - i\mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathrm{a}}(\alpha)$ as

$$U^{(k)}_{t,s} := \overleftarrow{\mathrm{T}} \exp\left[-i \int_s^t dt' \left(\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{p}}(t') + \mathcal{L}^{(k)}_{\mathrm{a}}(\alpha)\right)\right]. \tag{37}$$

Here $\overleftarrow{\mathrm{T}}$ is the time-ordering operator (the arrow implies the direction from past to future). Then we can obtain the formal integral equation for $Q^{(k)}_{N,t}$ from Eq. (31) as

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{(k)}_{N,t} =& U^{(k)}_{t,0} Q^{(k)}_{N,0}(0) + \int_0^t dt_1 U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} Q^{(k+1)}_{N,t_1} \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \int_0^t dt_1 U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{V}^{(k)} Q^{(k)}_{N,t_1} - \frac{k}{N} \int_0^t dt_1 U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} Q^{(k+1)}_{N,t_1}. \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

It is almost the same as Eq. (11). By substituting this expression into RHS iteratively L times, we obtain the following Duhamel series expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{(k)}_{N,t} =& \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots \mathcal{W}^{k+l-1} U^{(k+l)}_{t_l,0} Q^{(k+l)}_{N,0} \\ &+ \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots U^{(k+L-1)}_{t_{L-1},t_L} \mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)} Q^{(k+L)}_{N,t_L} \\ &+ \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots U^{(k+l-1)}_{t_{l-1},t_l} \mathcal{V}^{(k+l-1)} Q^{(k+l-1)}_{N,t_l} \\ &- \sum_{l=1}^{L} \frac{k+l-1}{N} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \\ &\qquad \ldots U^{(k+l-1)}_{t_{l-1},t_l} \mathcal{W}^{(k+l-1)} Q^{(k+l)}_{N,t_l}. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

Similarly, we can obtain the Duhamel expansion for the MF density matrix $Q^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},t}$:

$$\begin{aligned} Q^{(k)}_{\mathrm{MF},t} =& \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots \mathcal{W}^{k+l-1} U^{(k+l)}_{t_l,0} Q^{(k+l)}_{\mathrm{MF},0} \\ &+ \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L U^{(k)}_{t,t_1} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots U^{(k+L-1)}_{t_{L-1},t_L} \mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)} Q^{(k+L)}_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}. \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

These expansions are the starting point for justification of the MF theory.

4.2 Restriction of observables

Let $\mathcal{O}^{(k)}$ be an operator acting on the Hilbert space $\bigotimes_{j=0}^{k} \mathcal{H}_j$. Because the creation and annihilation operators for bosons are unbounded operators, it is hard to prove that expectation values of an *arbitrary* operator $\mathcal{O}^{(k)}$ calculated by $Q_{N,t}^{(k)}$ coincides with that by $Q_{\mathrm{MF},t}$. Therefore, we now restrict the physical quantities.

In this chapter, we focus only on the observables $\mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}) \in \mathcal{B}$. The set of observables $\mathcal{B}$ is defined as follows. All the observables $\mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}) \in \mathcal{B}$ satisfy the following conditions; there exist constants $c_0, c_a, \{c_r\} \in \mathbb{C}$, with $\lim_{\Lambda\to\infty} \sum_r |c_r|^2 < +\infty$, $\{a_q > 0\}$, $s > 0$, and $\kappa > 0$ such that

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^m \mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\})}{\partial\alpha_{\sigma_1}\partial\alpha_{\sigma_2}\dots\alpha_{\sigma_m}} \right\|_\infty \le \kappa^m \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha + \sum_r c_r\beta_r \right|^q , \tag{41}$$

for all $m = 0, 1, \dots$ and for all $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=1}^m$. Here $\sigma_j = \pm 1$, $\alpha_1 := \alpha$, and $\alpha_{-1} := \alpha^*$. For instance, all the operators expressed by a polynomial of $\left\{a, a^\dagger, \left\{\vec{S}_i\right\}_{i=1}^{k}\right\}$ belong to $\mathcal{B}$ after the correspondence $\{a/\sqrt{N} \to \alpha, a^\dagger/\sqrt{N} \to \alpha^*\}$ is made.

The derivatives $\partial/\partial\alpha$ and $\partial/\partial\alpha^*$ appear because of the quantum fluctuation, i.e. the commutation relation $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$. Roughly speaking, the condition 41 means that we exclude observables which are too sensitive to quantum fluctuations.

4.3 Free time evolution of the 0-subsystem

Let us define

$$U_{t,s}^{(\mathrm{p})} := \overleftarrow{\mathrm{T}} \exp\left[-i\int_s^t dt' \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{p}}(t')\right]. \tag{42}$$

For an arbitrary function $f(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\})$,

$$f(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}) U_{t,0}^{(\mathrm{p})} = U_{t,0}^{(\mathrm{p})} f(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t), \{\beta_r(t), \beta_r^*(t)\}), \tag{43}$$

where $\alpha(t)$ is the solution of the following equation,

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{d}{dt}\alpha(t) = -i\left[\omega_{\mathrm{p}}\alpha(t) + \xi(t) + \displaystyle\sum_r \lambda_r\beta_r(t)\right], \\ \dfrac{d}{dt}\beta_r(t) = -i\left(\omega_r\beta_r(t) + \lambda_r\alpha(t)\right), \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

with the initial condition $\alpha(0) = \alpha$ and $\beta_r(0) = \beta_r$. Because these equations are linear, the solutions are written in the form

$$\begin{cases} \alpha(t) = h_a(t) + g_{aa}(t)\alpha + \displaystyle\sum_r g_{ar}(t)\beta_r, \\ \beta_r(t) = h_r(t) + g_{ra}(t)\alpha + \displaystyle\sum_{r'} g_{rr'}(t)\beta_{r'}. \end{cases} \tag{45}$$

It is noted that

$$\begin{cases} |g_{aa}(t)|^2 + \sum_r |g_{ar}(t)|^2 = 1, \\ |g_{ra}(t)|^2 + \sum_{r'} |g_{rr'}(t)|^2 = 1. \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

The matrix $g(t)$ is a unitary and symmetric matrix.

The following property derived from Eq. (43) is important:

$$U_{t,s}^{(k)} U_{s,0}^{(\mathrm{p})} = U_{t,0}^{(\mathrm{p})} \tilde{U}_{t,s}^{(k)}, \tag{47}$$

where

$$\tilde{U}_{t,s}^{(k)} := \overleftarrow{T} \exp\left[-i\int_s^t dt' \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{a}}^{(k)}(\alpha(t'))\right]. \tag{48}$$

5 Exactness of the MF dynamics in the optical cavity system

5.1 Statement

From now on, we prove that the MF theory is exact in the limit of $N \to \infty$ in the sense that if initially

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r\right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}\right) \left(Q_{N,0}^{(k)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},0}^{(k)}\right) = 0 \tag{49}$$

for $\forall \mathcal{O}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{B}$ and any fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}$, it implies that

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r\right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}\right) \left(Q_{N,t}^{(k)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},t}^{(k)}\right) = 0 \tag{50}$$

for any fixed time $t > 0$.

5.2 Some comments

We make some remarks here on our result:

- Our result is quite general: Environments may be attached to the system of interest, and the time-dependent driving field may be applied. When an environment is large enough, it acts as a thermal reservoir on the system of interest, hence the result of this work is applicable to open quantum systems. However, we assumed the special Hamiltonian for the 0-environment, $H_{\mathrm{B}_0} + H_{\mathrm{I}_0}$ in Eq. (21). It is preferable to generalize our result to more wide class of 0-environmental Hamiltonians in the future.

- We restricted the class of physical quantities to $\mathcal{B}$ in the present work. This restriction, however, might be just a technical assumption. To extend to more general class of operators is an important issue. Another important issue is to treat the fluctuations. For instance, $a^\dagger a/N = (aa^\dagger - 1)/N = (a/\sqrt{N})(a^\dagger/\sqrt{N}) - 1/N$ belongs to $\mathcal{B}$, but $(a^\dagger a - \langle a^\dagger\rangle\langle a\rangle)/\sqrt{N}$, whose expectation value converges to a finite value as $N \to \infty$, does not. In the seminal work by Hepp and Lieb [16], the authors showed that, under the singular reservoir limit and the approximation to replace the bosons by the ensemble of fermions, the equations of motion for the fluctuations are equal to the linearized equation of the intensive observables, which is known as the Onsager's regression hypothesis [29–31]. We have not been able to confirm the validity of this hypothesis without those approximations yet.

- Without the driving force, and if the thermal reservoirs have an identical temperature, the MF dynamics usually predicts thermalization of the system of interest. It means that the limit of $N \to \infty$ and the limit of $t \to \infty$ are interchangeable under such an equilibrium situation. In other words, there is no QSS in open systems under the equilibrium situation, which is in contrast to closed systems, see [32] for this aspect. However, it is less obvious whether or not the thermodynamic limit and the long-time limit are interchangeable under the nonequilibrium situation studied in this paper. In the present work, we always take the limit of $N \to \infty$ first and then the limit of $t \to \infty$. In real experimental setup, there can be a situation in which the thermodynamic limit ought to be taken after the long-time limit since the number of atoms in the cavity is not large enough.

- We can justify the MF theory, but it is a separate issue whether the MF dynamical equations, Eqs. (24) and (25), can be solved. Since the degrees of freedom of environmental systems remain, it is difficult to solve exactly the MF dynamical equations. It is very interesting if we can exactly solve the quantum dynamics of the whole system including thermal reservoirs with the help of the MF theory. If it is done, we will be able to obtain some insight into effects of the non-Markovian dynamics [25] and the accuracy of the perturbative quantum master equation in long times [33, 34] *in an interacting many body system*. When the system of interest is small, which is the standard setting of open quantum systems, it is recognized that the non-Markovian effect is negligible in the van Hove limit [35]. When the system of interest is large, however, it is not obvious whether the use of the Born-Markov quantum master equation is justified even for the small coupling between the system of interest and the thermal bath because two limits, the thermodynamic limit and the van Hove limit, are involved. Therefore it is important to obtain the exact time evolution in a macroscopic open system. It is noted that Merkli and Berman [23] recently obtained the rigorous result in this direction for a simple model which is purely dephasing and where the relaxation of energy does not take place.

We hope that the result of this work becomes a good starting point to consider the above remaining problems and analyze some interesting nonequilibrium phenomena.

6 Proof of the statement

6.1 Finiteness of the average value of observables

First of all, we prove that all the average values of observables $\mathcal{O}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{B}$ at time t are finite as long as they are also finite at initial time $t = 0$. Unboundedness of operators is obstructive for our proof, hence this property is desirable. Once we can show this property, the justification of the MF approximation is almost straightforward.

From Eq. (39) and Eq. (40), we obtain

$$\left|\int d^2\alpha\left(\prod_r\int d^2\beta_r\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k}\mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha,\alpha^*,\{\beta_r,\beta_r^*\}\right)Q^{(k)}_{N,t}\right|\leq B_1+B_2+B_3+B_4. \tag{51}$$

$\{B_i\}$ are defined by

$$\begin{cases} B_1=\displaystyle\sum_{l=0}^{L-1}\left|\int d^2\alpha\left(\prod_r\int d^2\beta_r\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k}\mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha,\alpha^*,\{\beta_r,\beta_r^*\}\right)\right. \\ \left.\quad\times\displaystyle\int_0^t dt_1\int_0^{t_1}dt_2\ldots\int_0^{t_{l-1}}dt_l U^{(k)}_{t,t_1}\mathcal{W}^{(k)}U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2}\mathcal{W}^{(k+1)}\ldots\mathcal{W}^{(k+l-1)}U^{(k+l)}_{t_l,0}Q^{(k+l)}_{N,0}\right|, \\ B_2=\left|\displaystyle\int d^2\alpha\left(\prod_r\int d^2\beta_r\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k}\mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha,\alpha^*,\{\beta_r,\beta_r^*\}\right)\right. \\ \left.\quad\times\displaystyle\int_0^t dt_1\int_0^{t_1}dt_2\ldots\int_0^{t_{L-1}}dt_L U^{(k)}_{t,t_1}\mathcal{W}^{(k)}U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2}\mathcal{W}^{(k+1)}\ldots U^{(k+L-1)}_{t_{L-1},t_L}\mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)}Q^{(k+L)}_{N,t_L}\right|, \end{cases}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} B_3=\dfrac{1}{N}\displaystyle\sum_{l=1}^{L}\left|\int d^2\alpha\left(\prod_r\int d^2\beta_r\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k}\mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha,\alpha^*,\{\beta_r,\beta_r^*\}\right)\right. \\ \left.\quad\times\displaystyle\int_0^t dt_1\int_0^{t_1}dt_2\ldots\int_0^{t_{l-1}}dt_l U^{(k)}_{t,t_1}\mathcal{W}^{(k)}U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2}\mathcal{W}^{(k+1)}\ldots U^{(k+l-1)}_{t_{l-1},t_l}\mathcal{V}^{(k+l-1)}Q^{(k+l-1)}_{N,t_l}\right| \\ B_4=\displaystyle\sum_{l=1}^{L}\frac{k+l-1}{N}\left|\int d^2\alpha\left(\prod_r\int d^2\beta_r\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k}\mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha,\alpha^*,\{\beta_r,\beta_r^*\}\right)\right. \\ \left.\quad\times\displaystyle\int_0^t dt_1\int_0^{t_1}dt_2\ldots\int_0^{t_{l-1}}dt_l U^{(k)}_{t,t_1}\mathcal{W}^{(k)}U^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2}\mathcal{W}^{(k+1)}\ldots U^{(k+l-1)}_{t_{l-1},t_l}\mathcal{W}^{(k+l-1)}Q^{(k+l)}_{N,t_l}\right|. \end{cases}$$

Remaining part of this section is dedicated to the evaluation of the upper bounds of B_i ($i=1,\ldots,4$).

Evaluation of B_1

First we consider the term B_1. From Eqs. (34), (35), and (47), we obtain the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned} B_1=\sum_{l=0}^{L-1}&\left|\int d^2\alpha\left(\prod_r\int d^2\beta_r\right)\mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k}\mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha(t),\alpha^*(t))\int_0^t dt_1\int_0^{t_1}dt_2\ldots\int_0^{t_{l-1}}dt_l\right. \\ &\times\sum_{\{\sigma_j=\pm1\}}^{l}\tilde{U}^{(k)}_{t,t_1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)}\mathrm{Tr}_{k+1}X^{(\sigma_1)}_{k+1}\tilde{U}^{(k+1)}_{t_1,t_2}\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_{\sigma_2}(t_2)}\mathrm{Tr}_{k+2}X^{(\sigma_2)}_{k+2} \\ &\left.\ldots\frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_{\sigma_l}(t_l)}\mathrm{Tr}_{k+l}X^{(\sigma_l)}_{k+l}\tilde{U}^{(k+l)}_{t_l,0}Q^{(k+l)}_{N,0}\right|, \end{aligned} \tag{52}$$

where $X_j^{(1)} := X_j$ and $X_j^{(-1)} := X_j^\dagger$. By performing integration by part, we obtain

$$B_1 = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \Bigg| \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k+l}$$

$$\times \sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}}^{l} X_{k+1}^{(\sigma_1)} X_{k+2}^{(\sigma_2)} \ldots X_{k+l}^{(\sigma_l)}$$

$$\times \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_l}(t_l)} \bigg\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_{l-1}}(t_{l-1})} \bigg\{ \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \bigg\{ \mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t), \{\beta_r(t), \beta_r^*(t)\})$$

$$\times \tilde{U}_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \bigg\} \tilde{U}_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \bigg\} \ldots \tilde{U}_{t_{l-1},t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \bigg\} \tilde{U}_{t_l,0}^{(k+l)} \left(Q_{N,0}^{(k+l)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},0}^{(k+l)} \right) \Bigg|. \tag{53}$$

We put

$$B_1^{(k+l)} := \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l \sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}}^{l} X_{k+1}^{(\sigma_1)} X_{k+2}^{(\sigma_2)} \ldots X_{k+l}^{(\sigma_l)}$$

$$\times \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_l}(t_l)} \bigg\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_{l-1}}(t_{l-1})} \bigg\{ \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \bigg\{$$

$$\times \mathcal{O}^{(k)} \left(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t), \{\beta_r(t), \beta_r^*(t)\} \right) \tilde{U}_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \bigg\} \tilde{U}_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \bigg\} \ldots \tilde{U}_{t_{l-1},t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \bigg\} \tilde{U}_{t_l,0}^{(k+l)}. \tag{54}$$

Then B_1 is expressed as

$$B_1 = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \left| \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k+l} B_1^{(k+l)} Q_{N,0}^{(k+l)} \right|. \tag{55}$$

In Eq. (54), the quantity like

$$\frac{\partial^n \tilde{U}_{t,s}^{(k)}}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1) \partial \alpha_{\sigma_2}(t_2) \ldots \partial \alpha_{\sigma_n}(t_n)}$$

appears. We find that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{U}_{t,s}^{(k)}}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} &= -i \int_s^t dt' \tilde{U}_{t,t'}^{(k)} \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{a}}(\alpha(t'))}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \tilde{U}_{t',s}^{(k)} \\ &= -ig \int_s^t dt' \tilde{U}_{t,t'}^{(k)} \frac{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t')}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \sum_{j=1}^{k} X_j^{(-\sigma_1)\times} \tilde{U}_{t',s}^{(k)} \\ &= -ig \int_s^t dt' \tilde{U}_{t,t'}^{(k)} g_{aa}(t' - t_1) \sum_{j=1}^{k} X_j^{(-\sigma_1)\times} \tilde{U}_{t',s}^{(k)}, \end{aligned} \tag{56}$$

where $X_j^{(-\sigma_1)\times}(\cdot) := [X_j^{(-\sigma_1)}, (\cdot)]$ is the commutator. Remember that $|g_{aa}(t)| \leq 1$ because of Eq. (46). Therefore,

$$\left\| \frac{\partial \tilde{U}_{t,s}^{(k)}}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \right\|_\infty \leq 2kg \|X\|_\infty (t - s). \tag{57}$$

Similarly, we can obtain

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^n \tilde{U}^{(k)}_{t,s}}{\partial\alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)\partial\alpha_{\sigma_2}(t_2)\dots\partial\alpha_{\sigma_n}(t_n)} \right\|_\infty \leq \left[2kg\|X\|_\infty(t-s)\right]^n . \tag{58}$$

Because of Eq. (58), we can replace $\partial\tilde{U}_{t,s}/\partial\alpha_\sigma(t')$ simply by $2kg\|X\|_\infty(t-s)\tilde{U}_{t,s}$ as far as it is concerned with the upper bound of the operator norm. This fact makes much easier to evaluate the upper bound.

We define the set

$$\mathcal{N}_{l,n} := \{\{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n\} : 1 \leq m_1 < m_2 < \dots < m_n \leq l, \quad m_j \in \mathbb{N}\} .$$

If one of the elements of $\mathcal{N}_{l,n}$ is denoted by $N_{l,n} = \{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n\}$, we define $N^c_{l,n} := \{1, 2, \dots, l\}\backslash N_{l,n}$.

By using Eq. (58), we then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|B_1^{(k+l)}\right\|_\infty \leq & \frac{(g\|X\|_\infty t)^l}{l!} \sum_{\{\sigma_j=\pm1\}} \sum_{n=0}^{l} \sum_{N_{l,n}\in\mathcal{N}_{l,n}} \\ & \times \left\| \left(\prod_{j\in N_{l,n}} \frac{\partial}{\partial\alpha_{\sigma_j}(t)} \right) \mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t), \{\beta_r(t), \beta_r^*(t)\}) \right\|_\infty \\ & \times (k+l-1)(k+l-2)\dots(k+n) \times (2g\|X\|_\infty t)^{l-n}. \end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

Because $\mathcal{O}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|B_1^{(k+l)}\right\|_\infty \leq & \frac{(g\|X\|_\infty t)^l}{l!} \sum_{\{\sigma_j=\pm1\}} \sum_{n=0}^{l} \sum_{N_{l,n}\in\mathcal{N}_{l,n}} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q \kappa^n \\ & \times (k+l-1)(k+l-2)\dots(k+n) \times (2g\|X\|_\infty t)^{l-n}. \end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

Since $\sum_{\{\sigma_j=\pm1\}} 1 = 2^l$, $\sum_{N_{l,n}\in\mathcal{N}_{l,n}} 1 = l!/(n!(l-n)!)$, we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} \left\|B_1^{(k+l)}\right\|_\infty \leq & \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{(k+l-1)!}{(l-n)!(k+n-1)!} (2g\|X\|_\infty t)^{2l-n} \\ & \times \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q . \end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

Here we used $(k+l-1)!/[(l-n)!(k+n-1)!] \leq 2^{k+l-1}$ and restrict the time interval $t \in [0, t_0]$ where t_0 is determined by $2g\|X\|_\infty t_0 = 1/2$. This restriction will be removed later. Then we obtain

$$\left\|B_1^{(k+l)}\right\|_\infty \leq 2^{k-l-1} e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q . \tag{62}$$

From Eq. (55) and Eq. (62), we obtain

$$B_1 \leq 2^k e^{2\kappa} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r\right) \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t)\right|^q Q_{N,0}^{(0)}. \tag{63}$$

Here $|c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t)|^q \in \mathcal{B}$ (which will be explicitly shown later). Because at the initial time $t = 0$, for any $\mathcal{O}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{B}$, the average value is finite by assumption. Therefore, B_1 is also finite.

Evaluation of B_2

B_2 is given by

$$B_2 = \left| \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r\right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}\right) \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L \right.$$
$$\left. U_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots U_{t_{L-1},t_L}^{(k+L-1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)} Q_{N,t_L}^{(k+L)} \right| \tag{64}$$

This is written in the form

$$B_2 \leq \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r\right) \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k+L} \left\| B_2^{(k+L)} \right\|_\infty Q_{N,t_L}^{(k+L)}, \tag{65}$$

where $B_2^{(k+L)}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} B_2^{(k+L)} :=& g^L \sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}}^{l} X_{k+1}^{(\sigma_1)} X_{k+2}^{(\sigma_2)} \ldots X_{k+L}^{(\sigma_L)} \\ & \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_L}(t_L)} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_{L-1}}(t_{L-1})} \left\{ \cdots \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \left\{ \right.\right.\right. \\ & \left.\left.\left. \times \mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t), \{\beta_r(t), \beta_r^*(t)\}\right) \tilde{U}_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \right\} \tilde{U}_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \right\} \ldots \tilde{U}_{t_{L-1},t_L}^{(k+L-1)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{66}$$

Similarly to the evaluation of B_1, we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} B_2 \leq& \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r\right) \int_0^t dt_1 \ldots \int_0^{t_L - 1} dt_L L! (2g\|X\|_\infty)^L \\ & \times \sum_{m=0}^{L} \frac{1}{m!} 2^{k+L-1} (2g\|X\|_\infty t)^{L-m} \kappa^m \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q Q_{N,t_L}^{(k+L)} \\ \leq& (2g\|X\|_\infty t)^L \sum_{m=0}^{L} \frac{1}{m!} 2^{k+L-1} (2g\|X\|_\infty t)^{L-m} \\ & \times \kappa^m \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r\right) \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q Q_{N,t'}^{(k+L)} \end{aligned} \tag{67}$$

Here we again restrict the time interval $t \in [0, t_0]$ (t_0 was determined by $2g\|X\|_\infty t_0 = 1/2$ in the previous subsection). Then we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| B_2^{(k+L)} \right\|_\infty &\leq 2^{-L+k-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L} \frac{1}{m!} (2\kappa)^m \sum_{q=0} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q \\
&\leq 2^{-L+k-1} e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q \qquad (68)
\end{aligned}$$

Substituting it to Eq. (65), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
B_2 \leq & 2^{-L+k-1} \sum_{m=0}^{L} \frac{1}{m!} (2\kappa)^m \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \\
& \qquad \times \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q Q_{N,t'}^{(0)} \\
\leq & 2^{-L+k-1} e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q Q_{N,t'}^{(0)} \qquad (69)
\end{aligned}$$

Evaluation of B_3

Next we evaluate B_3 that is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
B_3 = & \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \Bigg| \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \mathcal{O}^{(k)} \left(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\} \right) \\
& \times \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots U_{t_{l-1},t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \mathcal{V}^{(k+l-1)} Q_{N,t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \Bigg| . \\
& \qquad (70)
\end{aligned}$$

If we put

$$\begin{aligned}
B_3^{(k+l)} := & (-ig)^l t \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l \\
& \times \sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}} X_{k+1}^{(\sigma_1)} X_{k+2}^{(\sigma_2)} \ldots X_{k+l}^{(\sigma_l)} \\
& \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_l}(t_l)} \Bigg\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_{l-1}}(t_{l-1})} \Bigg\{ \cdots \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \Bigg\{ \\
& \times \mathcal{O}^{(k)} \left(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t), \{\beta_r(t), \beta_r^*(t)\} \right) \tilde{U}_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \Bigg\} \tilde{U}_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \Bigg\} \ldots \tilde{U}_{t_{l-1},t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \Bigg\} \mathcal{V}_{\sigma_l}^{(k+l)}, \qquad (71)
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\mathcal{V}_\sigma^{(k)}(\cdot) := \begin{cases} (\cdot) \sum_{j=1}^{k} X_j & \text{for } \sigma = 1, \\ \sum_{j=1}^{k} X_j^\dagger (\cdot) & \text{for } \sigma = -1, \end{cases} \qquad (72)$$

we obtain the upper bound of B_3:

$$B_3 \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \left\| B_3^{(k+l)} \right\|_\infty Q_{N,t'}^{(0)}. \tag{73}$$

Similarly to the evaluation of B_2, we obtain for $0 < t \leq t_0$

$$\left\| B_3^{(k+l)} \right\|_\infty \leq (k+l) 2^{k-l-1} e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q. \tag{74}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} B_3 \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L} (k+l) 2^{k-l-1} e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \\ \times \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q Q_{N,t_l}^{(0)}. \end{aligned} \tag{75}$$

By elementary calculation, we find $\sum_{l=1}^{L} l/2^l < 2$, and thus

$$B_3 < \frac{1}{N} 2^{k-1} (k+2) e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q Q_{N,t'}^{(0)}. \tag{76}$$

Evaluation of B_4

Finally we evaluate the contribution of B_4. Its upper bound is given by

$$B_4 \leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{l=1}^{L} \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \left\| B_4^{(k+l)} \right\|_\infty Q_{N,t'}^{(k+l)}, \tag{77}$$

where $B_4^{(k+l)}$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} B_4^{(k+l)} :=& (-ig)^l (k+l-1) \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l \\ &\times \sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}} X_{k+1}^{(\sigma_1)} X_{k+2}^{(\sigma_2)} \ldots X_{k+l}^{(\sigma_l)} \\ &\times \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_l}(t_l)} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_{l-1}}(t_{l-1})} \left\{ \ldots \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \left\{ \right.\right.\right. \\ &\left.\left.\left. \times \mathcal{O}^{(k)} \left(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t), \{\beta_r(t), \beta_r^*(t)\right) \tilde{U}_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \right\} \tilde{U}_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \right\} \ldots \tilde{U}_{t_{l-1},t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{78}$$

We can evaluate the upper bound of $B_4^{(k+l)}$ by some calculations similar to those in previous subsections, and the result is

$$\left\| B_4^{(k+l)} \right\|_\infty \leq (k+l-1) 2^{k-l-1} e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q, \tag{79}$$

for $0 \le t \le t_0$. Therefore, we conclude that

$$B_4 < \frac{1}{N} 2^{k-1}(k+1)e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q Q^{(0)}_{N,t'}, \tag{80}$$

in the time interval $0 \le t \le t_0$.

Proof of the finiteness of average values of observables

From the derived upper bounds of B_i $(i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ in this section, we show that the average value of any observable in $\mathcal{B}$ at any fixed time t is finite. Collecting the derived upper bounds, Eqs. (62), (69), (76), and (80), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \langle \mathcal{O}^{(k)} \rangle_t \right| <& 2^k e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left\langle \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q \right\rangle_0 \\ &+ 2^{k-1} e^{2\kappa} \left(2^{-L} + \frac{2k+3}{N} \right) \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \left\langle \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q \right\rangle_{t'} \\ \equiv& 2^k e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left\langle \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q \right\rangle_0 \\ &+ \sum_{q=0}^{s} b_q \max_{t' \in [0,t]} \left\langle \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right|^q \right\rangle_{t'}, \end{aligned} \tag{81}$$

where $b_q = 2^{k-1} e^{2\kappa} (2^{-L} + (2k+3)/N) a_q$. We can see that $b_q \to 0$ in the limit of $N \to \infty$ and $L \to \infty$. Therefore, in the limit of $N \to \infty$, we can choose b_q as an arbitrarily small value. Here $\langle \cdot \rangle_t := \int d^2\alpha (\prod \int d^2\beta_r)(\cdot) Q^{(0)}_{N,t}$ is shorthand notation of the averaged value. In order to show the finiteness, we must show that

$$\max_{t' \in [0,t]} \left\langle \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t) \right| \right\rangle_{t'}$$

is finite.

In order to do so, we put

$$\mathcal{O}^{(k)} = \left| d_0 + d_a\alpha + \sum_r d_r\beta_r \right|^n =: \mathcal{O}_n, \tag{82}$$

and define

$$\mathcal{O}_n(t) := \left| d_0 + d_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r d_r\beta_r(t) \right|^n. \tag{83}$$

Because the constants d_0, d_a, and $\sum_r |d_r|^2$ are finite, the generality is not lost if we restrict these constants as

$$|\vec{d}|^2 := |d_0|^2 + |d_a|^2 + \sum_r |d_r|^2 \le 1. \tag{84}$$

Obviously, $\mathcal{O}_n \in \mathcal{B}$ with $s = n$, $c_0 = d_0$, $c_a = d_a$, $c_r = d_r$, $\kappa = nd_a$, and $a_q = 1$.

Now we evaluate the quantity

$$\mathcal{X}_n := \max_{\vec{d}:|\vec{d}|\leq 1} \max_{t'\in[0,t]} \langle \mathcal{O}_n \rangle_{t'}.$$

From Eq. (81), we have

$$\mathcal{X}_n < 2^k e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{n} \left\langle \mathcal{O}_q(t) \right\rangle_0 + b \sum_{q=0}^{n} \max_{\vec{d}:|\vec{d}|\leq 1} \max_{t'\in[0,t]} \left\langle \mathcal{O}_q(t) \right\rangle_{t'}, \tag{85}$$

where $b = 2^{k-1} e^{2\kappa}[2^{-L} + (2k+3)/N]$.

Now we use the property of $\alpha(t)$ and $\beta_r(t)$. By substituting Eq. (45) into the definition of $\mathcal{O}_q(t)$, we have

$$\mathcal{O}_q(t) = \left| d'_0 + d'_a \alpha + \sum_r d'_r \beta_r \right|^q, \tag{86}$$

where

$$\begin{cases} d'_0 = d_0 + d_a h_a(t) + \sum_r d_r h_r(t) =: \vec{d} \cdot \vec{h}(t), \\ d'_a = d_a g_{aa}(t) + \sum_r d_r g_{ra}(t), \\ d'_r = d_a g_{ar}(t) + \sum_{r'} d_{r'} g_{r'r}(t). \end{cases}$$

The norm of this new vector $\vec{d'}$ is given by

$$|\vec{d'}|^2 = |d'_0|^2 + |d'_a|^2 + \sum_r |d'_r|^2 \leq |\vec{h}(t)|^2 + \sum_x \left| \sum_{x'} d_{x'} g_{x'x}(t) \right|^2,$$

where $x, x' \in \{a, \{r\}\}$. Now we use the fact that the matrix $g(t)$ is unitary (absolute value of any eigenvalue of $g(t)$ is unity). It yields

$$|\vec{d'}|^2 \leq |\vec{h}(t)|^2 + 1, \tag{87}$$

and this is a finite constant for any fixed time t. This also indicates that $\mathcal{O}_q(t) \in \mathcal{B}$, therefore, the first term of RHS in Eq. (85) is finite. We write it as $f_n(t) = 2^k e^{2\kappa} \sum_{q=0}^{n} \left\langle \mathcal{O}_q(t) \right\rangle_0$.

We define the vector $\vec{d''} := \vec{d'}/(|\vec{h}(t)|^2 + 1)$, whose norm is less than or equal to unity, $|\vec{d''}| \leq 1$ regardless of the choice of $\vec{d}$. Obviously $\left\{ \vec{d''} : |\vec{d''}| \leq 1 \right\} \supseteq \left\{ \vec{d''} : |\vec{d}| \leq 1 \right\}$. Therefore, from Eqs. (85) and (86), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{X}_n &< f_n(t) + b\left(|\vec{h}(t)|^2 + 1 \right) \sum_{q=0}^{n} \max_{\vec{d}:|\vec{d}|\leq 1} \max_{t'\in[0,t]} \left\langle \left| d''_0 + d''_a \alpha + \sum_r d''_r \beta_r \right|^q \right\rangle_{t'} \\ &\leq f_n(t) + b\left(|\vec{h}(t)|^2 + 1 \right) \sum_{q=0}^{n} \max_{\vec{d''}:|\vec{d''}|\leq 1} \max_{t'\in[0,t]} \left\langle \left| d''_0 + d''_a \alpha + \sum_r d''_r \beta_r \right|^q \right\rangle_{t'} \\ &= f_n(t) + b\left(|\vec{h}(t)|^2 + 1 \right) \sum_{q=0}^{n} \mathcal{X}_q \end{aligned} \tag{88}$$

Since we can choose b as an arbitrarily small number, by starting from $\mathcal{X}_0 = 1$, we can inductively show that all the $\mathcal{X}_n$ are finite by using the above inequality. It completes the proof of the finiteness of the expectation values, because RHS of Eq. (81) is then finite.

In particular, we find

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty} B_2 = \lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty} B_3 = \lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty} B_4 = 0. \tag{89}$$

6.2 Justification of the mean-field approach

The proof proceeds very similarly as the previous section. From Eqs. (39) and (40), we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned} &\left| \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}\right) \left(Q_{N,t}^{(k)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},t}^{(k)} \right) \right| \\ &\qquad\qquad \leq B_1' + B_2' + B_3 + B_4. \end{aligned} \tag{90}$$

Here B_3 and B_4 are the same ones in the previous subsections. B_1' and B_2' are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} B_1' &:= \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \left| \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}\right) \right. \\ &\times \left. \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l U_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots \mathcal{W}^{k+l-1} U_{t_l,0}^{(k+l)} \left(Q_{N,0}^{(k+l)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},0}^{(k+l)} \right) \right| \\ B_2' &:= \left| \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \mathcal{O}^{(k)}\left(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\}\right) \right. \\ &\times \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L U_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \\ &\qquad\qquad \left. \ldots U_{t_{L-1},t_L}^{(k+L-1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)} \left(Q_{N,t_L}^{(k+L)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}^{(k+L)} \right) \right|. \end{aligned} \tag{91}$$

In the previous section, we showed that $\lim_{N\to\infty} B_3 = \lim_{N\to\infty} B_4 = 0$ in the time interval $t \in [0, t_0]$. Therefore, the proof is completed by showing $\lim_{N\to\infty} B_1' = \lim_{N\to\infty} B_2' = 0$ and confirming that we can extend t to all positive values, $t \in [0, \infty)$.

Evaluation of B_1'

First we consider the term B_1'. Similarly to the case of B_1, we obtain the following expression:

$$\begin{aligned}
B_1' = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \Bigg| & \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{l-1}} dt_l \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k+l} \\
& \times \sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}}^{l} X_{k+1}^{(\sigma_1)} X_{k+2}^{(\sigma_2)} \ldots X_{k+l}^{(\sigma_l)} \\
& \times \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_l}(t_l)} \left\{ \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_{l-1}}(t_{l-1})} \left\{ \cdots \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_1}(t_1)} \left\{ \right.\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.\left. \times \mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t)) \tilde{U}_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \right\} \tilde{U}_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \right\} \ldots \tilde{U}_{t_{l-1},t_l}^{(k+l-1)} \right\} \tilde{U}_{t_l,0}^{(k+l)} \left(Q_{N,0}^{(k+l)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},0}^{(k+l)} \right) \Bigg| . \qquad (92)
\end{aligned}$$

It is expressed as

$$B_1' = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \left| \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k+l} B_1^{(k+l)} \left(Q_{N,0}^{(k+l)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},0}^{(k+l)} \right) \right| , \qquad (93)$$

where $B_1^{(k+l)}$ was defined by Eq. (54). From the assumption of the initial condition (49), we can conclude that $\lim_{N\to\infty} B_1' = 0$ if we can show $B_1^{(k+l)} \in \mathcal{B}$.

In order to show $B_1^{(k+l)} \in \mathcal{B}$, we must consider the quantity

$$\left\| \frac{\partial^m B_1^{(k+l)}}{\partial \alpha_{\tau_1} \partial \alpha_{\tau_2} \ldots \partial \alpha_{\tau_m}} \right\|_\infty , \qquad (94)$$

where $\tau_j = \pm 1$.

Calculation analogous to that for B_1 yields

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\| \frac{\partial^m B_1^{(k+l)}}{\partial \alpha_{\tau_1} \partial \alpha_{\tau_2} \ldots \partial \alpha_{\tau_m}} \right\|_\infty \le \frac{(g\|X\|_\infty t)^l}{l!} & \sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}} \sum_{n=0}^{l} \sum_{N_{l,n} \in \mathcal{N}_{l,n}} \sum_{p=0}^{m} \sum_{N_{m,p} \in \mathcal{N}_{m,p}} \\
& \left\| \left(\prod_{j \in N_{l,n}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\sigma_j}(t)} \right) \left(\prod_{j \in N_{m,p}^c} \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_{\tau_j}(t)} \right) \mathcal{O}^{(k)}(\alpha(t), \alpha^*(t)) \right\|_\infty \\
& \times (k+l)^p (k+l-1)(k+l-2)\ldots(k+n) \times (2g\|X\|_\infty t)^{l-n+p} . \qquad (95)
\end{aligned}$$

Because $\mathcal{O}^{(k)} \in \mathcal{B}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{\partial^m B_1^{(k+l)}}{\partial \alpha_{\tau_1} \partial \alpha_{\tau_2} \ldots \partial \alpha_{\tau_m}} \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq \frac{(g\|X\|_\infty t)^l}{l!} \sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}} \sum_{n=0}^{l} \sum_{N_{l,n} \in \mathcal{N}_{l,n}} \sum_{p=0}^{m} \sum_{N_{m,p} \in \mathcal{N}_{m,p}} \\
&\times (k+l)^p (k+l-1)(k+l-2)\ldots(k+n)(2g\|X\|_\infty t)^{l-n+p} \\
&\times \kappa^{n-m+p} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r \right|^q .
\end{aligned} \tag{96}$$

Since $\sum_{\{\sigma_j = \pm 1\}} 1 = 2^l$, $\sum_{N_{l,n} \in \mathcal{N}_{l,n}} 1 = l!/(n!(l-n)!)$, we obtain the upper bound

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left\| \frac{\partial^m B_1^{(k+l)}}{\partial \alpha_{\tau_1} \partial \alpha_{\tau_2} \ldots \partial \alpha_{\tau_m}} \right\|_\infty \\
&\leq 2^{k+l-1} \sum_{n=0}^{l} \frac{1}{n!} \kappa^n (2g\|X\|_\infty t)^{2n-l} \\
&\times [\kappa + 2(k+l)g\|X\|_\infty t]^m \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q .
\end{aligned} \tag{97}$$

From this expression, we find that $B_1^{(k+l)} \in \mathcal{B}$ for any fixed t. Thus we can conclude that

$$\lim_{N \to \infty} B_1' = 0. \tag{98}$$

Evaluation of B_2'

B_2' is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
B_2' = &\left| \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \mathcal{O}^{(k)} \left(\alpha, \alpha^*, \{\beta_r, \beta_r^*\} \right) \times \int_0^t dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \ldots \int_0^{t_{L-1}} dt_L \right. \\
&\left. U_{t,t_1}^{(k)} \mathcal{W}^{(k)} U_{t_1,t_2}^{(k+1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+1)} \ldots U_{t_{L-1},t_L}^{(k+L-1)} \mathcal{W}^{(k+L-1)} \left(Q_{N,t_L}^{(k+L)} - Q_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}^{(k+L)} \right) \right|
\end{aligned} \tag{99}$$

This is written in the form

$$B_2' \leq \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \left\| B_2^{(k+L)} \right\|_\infty \left(Q_{N,t_L}^{(k+L)} + Q_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}^{(k+L)} \right), \tag{100}$$

where $B_2^{(k+L)}$ is given by Eq. (66). From the upper bound of $B_2^{(k+L)}$ (see Eq. (68)), it yields

$$\begin{aligned}
B_2' \leq 2^{-L+k-1} e^{2\kappa} \int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r \right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a \alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r \beta_r(t) \right|^q \\
\times \left(Q_{N,t_L}^{(k+L)} + Q_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}^{(k+L)} \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{101}$$

which is almost the same as Eq. (69). Because

$$\lim_{N\to\infty}\int d^2\alpha \left(\prod_r \int d^2\beta_r\right) \mathrm{Tr}_{1,2,\ldots,k} \sum_{q=0}^{s} a_q \left| c_0 + c_a\alpha(t) + \sum_r c_r\beta_r(t)\right|^q \left(Q^{(k+L)}_{N,t_L} + Q^{(k+L)}_{\mathrm{MF},t_L}\right)$$

is finite and not diverging as $L \to \infty$, it is concluded that

$$\lim_{L\to\infty}\lim_{N\to\infty} B_2' = 0, \tag{102}$$

for $0 \leq t \leq t_0$.

Completion of justification of the mean-field theory

In the previous subsections, we showed that $B_1 + B_2 + B_3 + B_4 \to 0$ as $N \to \infty$ for $0 \leq t \leq t_0$. It means that Eq. (50) has been derived for $0 \leq t \leq t_0$. If we regard $t = t_0$ as a new initial time and repeat the argument, we can show that Eq. (50) is correct for any fixed time $t > 0$. Thus we completes the proof of justification of the MF dynamics.

References

[1] A. Polkovnikov, K. Sengupta, A. Silva, and M. Vengalattore, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 863 (2011).

[2] J. M. Deutsch, Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2046 (1991).

[3] M. Srednicki, Phys. Rev. E **50**, 888 (1994).

[4] S. Goldstein, J. L. Lebowitz, C. Mastrodonato, R. Tumulka, and N. Zanghi, Phys. Rev. E **81**, 011109 (2010).

[5] H. Tasaki, arXiv:1003.5424 (2010).

[6] T. Kibble, J, Phys. A: Math. Gen. **9**, 1387 (1976).

[7] W. Zurek, Nature **317**, 505 (1985).

[8] W. H. Zurek, U. Dorner, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 105701 (2005).

[9] B. Sciolla and G. Biroli, J. Stat. Mech. , P11003 (2011).

[10] M. Kastner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 130601 (2011).

[11] S. Diehl, A. Tomadin, A. Micheli, R. Fazio, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 015702 (2010).

[12] M. Knap, E. Arrigoni, W. von der Linden, and J. H. Cole, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 023821 (2011).

[13] A. Faribault, P. Calabrese, and J. Caux, J. Stat. Mech. , P03018 (2009).

[14] J. Mossel and J. Caux, New J. Phys. **12**, 055028 (2010).

[15] J. Sato, R. Kanamoto, E. Kaminishi, and T. Deguchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 110401 (2012).

[16] K. Hepp and E. Lieb, Helv. Phys. Acta **46**, 573 (1973).

[17] P. Drummond and D. Walls, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **13**, 725 (1980).

[18] P. Drummond, IEEE. J. Quantum Electron. **17**, 301 (1981).

[19] T. Shirai, T. Mori, and S. Miyashita, arXiv:1204.5516 (2012).

[20] H. Spohn, Rev. Mod. Phys. **52**, 569 (1980).

[21] L. Erdős, B. Schlein, and H. Yau, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 40404 (2007).

[22] B. Schlein, arXiv:0807.4307 (2008).

[23] M. Merkli and G. Berman, Proc. Roy. Soc. A **468**, 3398 (2012).

[24] R. Dicke, Phys. Rev. **93**, 99 (1954).

[25] H. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The theory of open quantum systems* (Oxford University Press, USA, 2002).

[26] J. Gripp, S. L. Mielke, L. A. Orozco, and H. J. Carmichael, Phys. Rev. A **54**, R3746 (1996).

[27] U. Weiss, *Quantum dissipative systems* (World Scientific Publishing Company Incorporated, 1999).

[28] K. Husimi, Some formal properties of the density matrix, in *Proc. Phys.-Math. Soc. Japan*, volume 22, pp. 264–314, 1940.

[29] L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **37**, 405 (1931).

[30] L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **38**, 2265 (1931).

[31] R. Kubo, M. Toda, and N. Hashitsume, *Statistical Physics II: Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics* (Springer, 1991).

[32] S. Gupta and D. Mukamel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 040602 (2010).

[33] T. Mori and S. Miyashita, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **77**, 124005 (2008).

[34] C. H. Fleming and N. I. Cummings, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 031117 (2011).

[35] E. Davies, *Quantum theory of open systems* (IMA, 1976).